

Appl. No. : 10/712,628
Applicants : Parham
Filed : 11/12/2003
Title : MULTI-PLAYER SECONDARY GAMING METHOD AND SYSTEM
TC/A.U. : 3714
Examiner : CARLOS, Alvin Leabres
Docket No. : TPARHAM.002US

Commissioner for Patents
P.O.Box 1450
Alexandria VA 22313-1450

STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW

In accordance with 37 CFR § 1.133 and MPEP § 713.04, Applicant hereby provides a statement as to the substance of a recent interview.

Date of Interview: January 27, 2010

Participants: Fidel Nwamu, Applicant's Representative
Carlos, Alvin Leabres, Examiner
Saadat, Cameron, Primary Examiner

Interview Type: Telephonic
Claims Discussed: Claims 1 and 2
Prior Art Discussed: Schneider, U.S. 6,358,149

Principal Proposed Amendments: Amending "duration" in claims to "time limit"

General Thrust of Arguments Presented By Applicant: Applicant argued that Schneider could not render the claim obvious since the particular limitation in claim 1 requires that "additional gaming devices are qualified during a designated duration after said first gaming device is qualified or during a predetermined number of primary game plays after qualification of said first gaming device." Claim 1. Examiner Carlos disagreed and cited Col. 8, lines 4-17.

Applicant then proceeded to read sentence by sentence through Col. 8, lines 4-17. The sentences mostly discussed

how bonus periods are triggered. Upon completion of reading, Applicant stated that the cited portion, which disclosed how bonus periods are triggered did not teach or suggest the claimed feature which requires that “the additional gaming devices are qualified during a designated duration.” Examiner Carlos did not disagree.

Applicant then began to explain the claimed feature. It was then suggested that the duration required by the claim was a time limit. Examiner Saadat then stated that such a time limit was not recited in the claims. The Applicant responded that the term “duration” was synonymous with time limit (see dictionary). Applicant then indicated that duration in the claims would be amended to time limit. Examiner Saadat responded that this was okay so long as the Spec. supported the amendment. Applicant further responded that the Amendment should not require a new search given the synonymous meaning of both terms.

Applicant further stated that a 1.132 affidavit would be filed. Examiner Saadat indicated that was okay and that the affidavit should be filed with the Notice of Appeal.

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of objection and rejections of all claims is respectfully requested. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at (510) 400-8890.

Respectfully submitted,

s/Fidel D. Nwamu/

Fidel D. Nwamu
Reg. No. 46,294

March 03, 2010

NWAMU, P.C.
PATENT AND TRADEMARK LAW
360 Grand Ave, #109
Oakland, CA 94610
Ph: (510) 400-8890
Email: Info@Nwamu.com